

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**SEP 13 2007**

**LAW OFFICES  
HURLEY & GUINN**

DANIEL W. HURLEY  
DAVID M. GUINN, JR.  
AARON R. CLEMENTS  
NATALIO HERNANDEZ

AARON R. CLEMENTS  
LICENSED TO PRACTICE IN TEXAS  
REGISTERED PATENT ATTORNEY  
EMAIL: AARONRC@SWBELL.NET

13 September 2007

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Re: App'n No. 10/724,409, Naizer et al.  
Art Unit 2672  
Examiner: Thompson

Dear Mr. Thompson:

Accompanying this letter please find our response to the second Office Action in the above-referenced application, which should be fully responsive to the issues raised therein. If there are any problems or questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

HURLEY & GUINN

BY:

  
AARON R. CLEMENTS  
Reg. No. 46,025

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I certify that this correspondence was transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, (571) 273-8300 on this the 13<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2007.

  
AARON R. CLEMENTS  
Attorney for Applicant

TELEPHONE (806) 771-0700 • 1805 13<sup>TH</sup> STREET, LUBBOCK, TEXAS 79401 • FAX (806) 763-8199

Application Number: 10/724,409  
Applicant: Naizer, et al.  
Art Unit: 3672

#### RESPONSE TO SECOND OFFICE ACTION

Accompanying this Response are claim amendments which Applicant would suggest are fully responsive to the rejection made under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Carlisle, et al., U.S. Pat. No. 2,465,060. In particular, Applicant would note the effect of the amendments to each claim:

With respect to Claim 1, Applicant is amending the language of Claim 1 to add a limitation that the base of the piston 110 is sealed by means such as the O-ring 118. Carlisle '060 contains no similar structure sealing the piston assembly in that invention against the wall of the chamber in which the piston assembly reciprocates, and Carlisle thus cannot be used in a manner similar to the instant invention, wherein a balance is maintained between the fluid pressure on the shoulders of the piston 110 and the spring pressure 112, with the pressure on the tip of the piston 110 resulting in a force which acts independently of that resulting from the fluid pressure on the shoulders of the piston 110.

With respect to Claim 2, the amendments constitute nothing more than rewriting the former Claim 2 in independent form with all of the limitations of the prior base Claim 1, which the examining attorney has held to be allowable.

Claim 3 is identical to the former Claim 3, which retains its dependency on Claim 1 and thus is amended by implication to include the seal limitation described in that base claim as amended.

Claims 4-8 are identical to their prior forms, pursuant to the examining attorney's finding that these claims are allowable.